

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5 and 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sharpe (USPN 5,228,337). Claims 11 and 13 have been canceled.

Amended claim 1 recites, “wherein the sensor means includes a sensor coil that is mounted annularly on a rim of the wheel and is coiled around a first axis, and wherein the reader means includes a receiver coil that is coiled around a second axis that is noncoincident with the first axis.” Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found, for example, in Fig. 9 and Fig. 12, which depict the sensor and receiver coils as coiled around different, noncoincident axes.

Sharpe does not teach a sensor coil that is coiled around a first axis and a receiver coil that is coiled around a second axis that is noncoincident with the first axis, as required by claim 1. Sharpe discloses a rotary transformer 36 having a primary coil mounted on an axle and a secondary coil mounted on a wheel hub rim (4:62-66). However, Sharpe does not teach that primary and secondary coils are coiled around respective noncoincident axes. Accordingly, Sharpe does not anticipate claim 1.

One advantage provided by the claimed noncoincident axes is that, unlike Sharpe’s rotary transformer, through-axle cable routing for the receiver coil is not required. Another advantage provided by the claimed noncoincident axes is that the sensor and receiver coils do not require costly ferromagnetic material for coil flux path linkage.

In view of the differences between the subject matter of claim 1 and the disclosure of Sharpe, applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by and is allowable over Sharpe. Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1. The arguments provided above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claims 5, 9, 10, 12 and 14.

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharpe in view of Chamussy (5,583,482). Claim 6 has been canceled.

Amended claim 7 requires a sensor coil that is mounted annularly on a rim and that is coiled around a first axis, and also a receiver coil that is coiled around a second axis that is noncoincident with the first axis. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Sharpe does not teach a sensor coil that is coiled around a first axis and a receiver coil that is coiled around a second axis that is noncoincident with the first axis. The deficiencies of Sharpe are not corrected by Chamussy. In view of the differences between the subject matter of claim 7 and the cited combination of references, applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable over said combination. Claim 8 depends from claim 7.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. PMAX-38219.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: Brad C. Spencer
Brad C. Spencer – Reg. No. 57,076

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 5, 2008